



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/637,409	08/11/2000	Paul S. Henry	1999-0785	7313

7590 05/16/2005

Samuel H Dworetsky
AT&T Corp
Post Office Box 4110
Middletown, NJ 07748-4110

EXAMINER

SHERKAT, AREZOO

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/637,409

Applicant(s)

HENRY ET AL.

Examiner

Arezoo Sherkat

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10,12-14 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10,12-14 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 August 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This office action is responsive to Applicant's amendment received on March 7, 2005. Claims 1-9, 11, and 15-17 are cancelled. Claims 10 and 14 are amended. Claims 10, 12-14, and 18-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 12-14, and 18-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that Peters fails to teach "previously generated" password.

Examiner responds that Peter specifically discloses that the site-specific password has been previously given to the website (Col. 3, lines 32-42).

Applicant also argues that "there is no discussion in Grimmer of universal access to a host of different online systems through a common password.

Examiner introduces newly found prior art to overcome Applicant's argument.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10, 12-14, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters, (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,300), in view of Grantges, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,648 and Grantges hereinafter).

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Peters discloses a method for providing access to multiple online accounts via a common password, the method comprising:

receiving a common password associated with an online account, and determining if the universal password is valid for the associated online account based upon a designated password which was previously generated for the associated online account, wherein the designated password was previously generated based upon a password transform calculation, the password calculation based upon a user ID for the associated online account, the universal password, and a server name (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Peters does not expressly disclose generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on the random number.

However, Nguyen discloses generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on at least the random number (Col. 6, lines 17-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Peters by including generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on the random number as disclosed by Grantges. This modification would have been obvious because

one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Grantges to preclude access by an unauthorized intruder who merely replays intercepted packets (Grantges, Col. 6, lines 17-24).

Regarding claim 14, Peters discloses a method for providing access to multiple Web accounts via a universal password which is valid for the multiple Web accounts, the method comprising:

providing a designated password for each of the multiple Web accounts, the designated password being calculated for each of the multiple Web accounts based on a hash function which incorporates the universal password as an input to the hash function, receiving the universal password for access to at least one of the multiple Web accounts, determining if the universal password is valid based on the associated designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts, and providing access to the at least one of the multiple Web accounts provided the universal password is valid (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Peters does not expressly disclose generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on the random number.

However, Nguyen discloses generating a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on at least the random number (Col. 6, lines 17-67 and Col. 7, lines 1-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Peters by including generating

Art Unit: 2131

a random number, and calculating the new designated password based on the random number as disclosed by Grantges. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Grantges to preclude access by an unauthorized intruder who merely replays intercepted packets (Grantges, Col. 6, lines 17-24).

Regarding claim 18, Peters discloses wherein determining if the universal password is valid based on the associated designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts includes:

receiving a user ID, receiving the associated designated password, and comparing the received associated designated password with a corresponding saved designated password for the at least one of the multiple Web accounts (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Peters does not expressly disclose retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID.

However, Nguyen discloses retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID (Col. 4, lines 23-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Peters by including retrieving an encrypted random number based on the user ID as disclosed by Grantges. This modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated by the suggestion of Grantges to preclude access by an

unauthorized intruder who merely replays intercepted packets (Grantges, Col. 6, lines 17-24).

Regarding claims 13 and 19, Peters discloses further comprising:
generating a designated password for each of the multiple online accounts which is accessible via the common password (Col. 2, lines 48-67 and Col. 3, lines 1-55).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 20 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2131

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arezoo Sherkat whose telephone number is (571) 272-3796. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Arezoo Sherkat
Patent Examiner
Group 2131
May 9, 2005



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100